

dustrial Life" appeal to all who are following the changing and rather disquieting phases of social life; and the opening chapter on "Individualism and Socialism from the Biological Standpoint" discusses a highly controversial question of first-rate importance. It is true that the author appears to use the words "Individualism" and "Socialism" in a sense slightly different from that which is customary, at any rate among professed individualists. It will be remembered that Spencer defined the two systems as those, respectively, of Voluntary Co-operation and Compulsory Co-operation, whereas the author seems to tend here to consider them in terms of Competition and Co-operation respectively. But the general view of social activities, seen in relation to biological truths, cannot fail to be illuminating to those who have been in the habit of thinking mainly in political terms. And the individualist will be reconciled to an apparent tendency somewhat to under-value voluntary co-operation by the author's conclusion that the socialism of the future "must be a Socialism which recognizes, not the equality, but the inequality of man. That is, the inequality of the individual citizen in Innate Capacity as well as in the acquirements which result from its exercise."

R. AUSTIN FREEMAN.

POPULATION

Himes, Norman E. (Editor). *Place on Population*. London, 1930. Allen and Unwin. Pp. 354. Price 12s. 6d.

MR. NORMAN HIMES, who has become the great historian of the birth control movement, and is now Associate Professor of Economics at the Clark University, Massachusetts, has rendered another signal service by the reproduction of Francis Place's *Illustrations and Proofs of the Principle of Population*, "the first work on Population in the English language recommending Birth Control," together with an Introduc-

tion demonstrating Francis Place as the founder of the modern birth control movement, several letters of Place on birth control, Coleridge's criticisms of Malthus's views on birth control, and critical and textual notes by the editor.

This book is of great interest and value to all concerned with the subject, as in the first place it clearly establishes, what is so often overlooked or disputed, that the birth control movement derived its inspiration directly from the population doctrine of Malthus, and owed its origin to the utilitarian neo-Malthusian pioneers of whom Francis Place was the foremost. Place, although of working-class origin and full of sympathy with the masses after his early experience of dire poverty and harsh treatment by employers, yet clearly saw that the great obstacle to the improvement of their conditions lay in their excessive fertility. It was this conviction on his part, after a thorough examination of the Godwin-Malthus controversy, combined with his complete disbelief in the remedy proposed by Malthus—late marriage with complete premarital chastity—which led in 1823 to his writing and circulating the "Diabolical Handbill," and two other leaflets, the first leaflets in which practical methods of birth control were described, and to his earnest and constant efforts to popularize this information. No one after reading this book can have any doubt that the birth control movement owed its origin to what has since been called neo-Malthusianism.

The second important feature of the book is its sociological outlook. It was undertaken, as its sub-title showed, as "an examination of the proposed remedies of Mr. Malthus and a reply to the objections of Mr. Godwin and others." As many are aware, it was Godwin's *Political Justice*, written in 1793 under the inspiration of the French Revolution, which moved Malthus to produce his *Essay on the Principle of Population* in 1789; and the controversy which ensued led Place to make the critical examination of the arguments on both sides which forms the subject-matter of the present book. Godwin may be described as the

father of English Socialism, in his sympathy and zeal for the masses, and his belief that humane distribution and good laws and institutions would eliminate poverty and all social evils. Malthus, on the other hand, not only represented cold logical science, but his birth, education, and circumstances lifted him completely from all experience of poverty; and this, combined with the stern and apparently harsh conclusions to which his doctrine led him, caused him to be regarded as being insensible to the sufferings of the poor, and as having devised his doctrine in the interests of the wealthy. This caused a cleavage between neo-Malthusianism and Socialism which has persisted to this day, and it would have been natural to expect that Francis Place, with his passionate sympathy for the poor, would have been biased largely on the side of Godwin. We find, however, that although he takes exception to the harsher conclusions of Malthus, and refuses to regard the two doctrines as antitheses (in which the Editor apparently agrees with him), he has no hesitation in deciding that Godwin's attempts at disproving the Malthusian doctrine are total failures at every point, and convicts him out of his own writings as guilty of the wildest inconsistencies. Had Place's example been followed by the Labour leaders since his time, how different the history of the last century would have been, and what volumes of useless and destructive effort we should have been spared. Whether we agree with Place concerning Malthus's economic conclusions or not, there is no reason why the Socialists should not have accepted Place's conclusions and remedy, which would have avoided the bitter class struggle and hatred from which we have been suffering, and which would have mitigated, if not completely prevented, the dysgenic effects of birth control.

We can only hope that Mr. Himes' timely production of this book will result in its being widely read, and that it will have its due effect in inducing wiser counsels in those to whom the masses look for guidance.

C. V. DRYSDALE.

AMENTIA

Board of Control. *Annual Report (16th) for the Year 1929.* Part I. London, 1930. Stationery Office. Pp. vi + 103. Price 1s. 9d.

It would be possible to quote and comment at almost unlimited length on this *Report*, but it is especially interesting to note the Board's attitude to the subject which at present is occupying most eugenic attention. On page 55 occurs the passage :

"On the question of sterilization we have little to add to what has been said in previous Reports. Since our last Report was written, Denmark has passed a law permitting sterilization with the consent of the patient or guardian. But this measure, like much legislation on this subject, is still so recent that no sufficient data are yet available by which to test its results. We still think that the whole question calls for careful study and investigation, but we recognize that scientific and impartial inquiry is rendered difficult by the atmosphere of controversy which sterilization excites and also by the exaggerated claims which are put forward by its advocates. Sterilization will not solve the many problems of the prevention of mental defect; indeed, it is doubtful whether it will appreciably reduce its incidence. In any case it would be absurd to suggest that its adoption would obviate the need for the institutional care and training of those defectives whose social inadaptability makes it impossible to leave them at large. But there are, in our opinion, cases in which it might be advantageous; and if the claims of its advocates are often exaggerated, the condemnation of its opponents rests on an equally unsubstantial foundation."

Now, many enthusiastic eugenicists have developed the habit of reproaching the Board, sometimes with some vigour, for its hesitant attitude towards sterilization; and they do not realize that a Government de-